



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/800,476	03/08/2001	Melissa Lee Denbar	95-462	4931
23164	7590	02/02/2006	EXAMINER	
LEON R TURKEVICH 2000 M STREET NW 7TH FLOOR WASHINGTON, DC 200363307			SEFCHECK, GREGORY B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2662	

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/800,476

Applicant(s)

DENBAR ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory B. Sefcheck

Art Unit

2662

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-22, 24-37 and 39-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-22, 24-37, and 39-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

- Applicant's Amendment filed 1/18/2006 is acknowledged.
- Claims 5, 24, and 39 have been amended.
- The previous rejection of claims 5, 24, and 39 under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph is withdrawn in light of the present amendments.
- Claims 1-3, 5-22, 24-37, and 39-49 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 10-12, 16, 20, 21, 29-31, 35, 36, 44, 45, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gibson et al. (US006775249B1), hereafter Gibson.

- In regards to Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 16, 20, 21, 30, 31, 35, 36, 45, and 49, Gibson discloses connection handling in communication networks (Title).

Referring to Figs. 2 and 3, Gibson discloses a method and computer readable medium for operating GIRAFF 220 (application server) of an interfacing gateway between networks (Col. 11, lines 26-42; Col. 12, lines 40-42; claim 1,11,16,45 – method and system having application server and gateway; claim 20,30,35 – system and

computer medium having instructions for executing a messaging session by a gateway and application server).

Gibson shows that an application process is initiated at CLI capture facility 350 upon receiving a call 300 and establishing a connection with the calling terminal (Col. 4, lines 45-50; claim 1, 11, 16, 20, 30, 35, 45 – initiating an instance of an application process for executing a sequence of messaging operations for a first type of incoming message, in response to reception of an initiation request from a gateway).

Gibson discloses CLI capture facility identifies information for the call and writes the information to message selector 310 (Col. 4, lines 50-58; claim 1, 11, 16, 20, 30, 35, 45 – initiating includes writing data into a structure that identifies information based on execution of the instance).

Gibson further discloses that fax detection facility 305 detects whether the call is a voice call or fax call and advises the message selector 310 to continue with processing of the appropriate call type, moving the call information to either FAX download 330 or Voice Download 355 based on the detection result (Col. 4, lines 59-64; claim 11, 16, 30, 45 – following sending the request, detecting by the gateway that the incoming call corresponds to second type incompatible with the first type and sending a reject message to the server; claim 1, 11, 16, 20, 30, 35, 45 – selectively terminating the instance by async event manager based on detecting, at a prescribed location in the sequence, a prescribed variable set during execution of the instance specifying second message type incompatible with the first type and the sequence of message operations are not to be performed – reject message; claim 1, 11, 16, 20, 30, 35, 45 – terminating

includes terminating execution of the operations subsequent to the prescribed location and removing the data from the structure; claim 2,21,36 – first type is a voice message).

Gibson shows that the incoming call constitutes an initiation of messaging for both voice and fax call types (Fig. 3; Col. 4, lines 45-64; Col. 11, lines 48-53; claim 12,16,31,49 - sending a second request concurrently with the first initiating request for initiation of a messaging session according to the second message type).

In Fig. 4a-b, Gibson shows that a voice message is downloaded and transmitted to the misdialing terminal regardless of whether the call is determined to be a fax call or a voice call. Therefore, Gibson does not explicitly show selectively terminating the instance prior to completing the sequence of messaging operations.

However, as shown above, Gibson discloses that the call is monitored by fax detection facility 305 in order to detect whether the call is a fax or voice call (Col. 4, lines 59-64). That detection result is then fed to message selector 310.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Gibson to enable selective termination of the instance prior to completing the sequence of messaging operations for a voice call. Because the fax detection facility of Gibson is capable of identifying the call as a non-voice call prior to the downloading and transmission of a voice message, terminating the voice call operations prior to the voice message downloading and transmission would eliminate unnecessary call processing and enable the system to operate more efficiently.

- In regards to Claims 10, 29, and 44,

Gibson discloses connection handling in communication networks that covers all limitations of the parent claims.

Referring to Fig. 3, Gibson shows fax detection facility 305 operates to detect if the call is a fax call. If fax tones are not detected on the incoming call, thereby indicating that the incoming call is a voice call, further voice call processing may proceed (claim 10,29,44 – selectively completing execution of the messaging operations, including transmission of a message recorded during execution of the instance, based on an absence of the prescribed variable being set upon the instance reaching the prescribed location in the prescribed sequence).

3. Claims 3, 5, 13, 14, 17, 19, 22, 24, 32, 33, 37, 39, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gibson in view of Chang et al. (US 20030095542A1), hereafter Chang.

- In regards to Claims 3, 22, and 37,

Gibson discloses connection handling in communication networks that covers all limitations of the parent claims. Gibson discloses that messaging operations specified for processing a voice call are terminated when the incoming call is detected as being a fax call.

Gibson does not explicitly disclose terminating the instance specifying a voice over IP protocol message.

Chang discloses an apparatus and method for an integrated voice gateway. Referring to Fig. 3, Chang shows an IP telephony module 59 of gateway device 26 capable of receiving both voice and fax calls over the internet using IP protocol (claim 3,22,37 – terminating the instance based on detecting a call rejection condition of a voip message).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the method and system of Gibson to voice and fax call transmitted through Internet Protocol, as shown by Chang. Process initiation and call type detection for subsequent processing disclosed by Gibson could then be performed for voice and fax calls transmitted over the Internet using IP protocol just as they are performed for conventionally transmitted voice and fax calls.

- In regards to Claims 5, 24, and 39,

Gibson discloses connection handling in communication networks that covers all limitations of the parent claims.

Referring to Fig. 3, Gibson shows fax detection facility 305 operates to detect if the call is a fax call. If fax tones are detected on the incoming call, thereby indicating that the incoming call is a fax call, further fax call processing may proceed (Col. 4, lines 59-64; claim 5,24,39 – determining includes identifying the incoming message as a fax message).

- In regards to Claims 13, 17, and 32,

Gibson discloses connection handling in communication networks that covers all limitations of the parent claims. Gibson discloses that the same module is used for initiating message sessions for voice and fax calls.

Gibson does not explicitly disclose sending the second request to a second server for initiating the message session according to the second message being a fax.

Chang discloses an apparatus and method for an integrated voice gateway. Referring to Fig. 3, Chang shows an IP telephony module 59 of gateway device 26 capable of receiving both voice and fax calls over the internet using IP protocol. Chang further discloses Fax Gateway 54 which interact with a separate fax server for sending and receiving fax messages (Pg. 7, paragraph 99; claim 13,17,32 – sending the second request includes outputting the second request to a second server for initiating the message session according to the second message being a fax).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and system of Gibson by utilizing a second server for initiating a message session according to a received fax, as shown by Chang. Having dedicated servers for handling different types of incoming calls enables multiple calls to be handled simultaneously.

- In regards to Claims 14, 19, 33, and 48,

Gibson discloses connection handling in communication networks that covers all limitations of the parent claims. Gibson discloses voice and fax as being the two types of messages (claim 14,33,48 – first message is voice, second is fax).

Gibson does not explicitly disclose generating and sending a reject message specifying a voice over IP call reject message.

Chang discloses an apparatus and method for an integrated voice gateway. Referring to Fig. 3, Chang shows an IP telephony module 59 of gateway device 26 capable of receiving both voice and fax calls over the internet using IP protocol (claim 14,19,33,48 – generating/sending a reject message to specify a voip call reject message).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the method and system of Gibson to voice and fax call transmitted through Internet Protocol, as shown by Chang. Process initiation and call type detection for subsequent processing disclosed by Gibson could then be performed for voice and fax calls transmitted over the Internet using IP protocol just as they are performed for conventionally transmitted voice and fax calls.

4. Claims 6-9, 15, 18, 25-28, 34, 40-43, 46, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gibson in view of Ito (US005594783A).

- In regards to Claims 6, 7, 9, 15, 18, 25, 26, 28, 34, 40, 41, 43, 46, and 47,

Gibson discloses connection handling in communication networks that covers all limitations of the parent claims.

Gibson does not explicitly disclose deleting a recorded message prior to storage in a subscriber message store.

Ito discloses a telephone apparatus for recording a predetermined message in place of a CNG tone. Ito discloses that a telephone starts recording a message prior to detecting the call is a fax call. Upon such detection, Ito shows that the recorded message is deleted and a switching message is recorded (Title; Abstract; claim 6,15,18,25,34,40,46 – removing includes deleting a recorded message prior to storage in a subscriber message store in response to reject message; claim 7,26,41,47 – terminating includes adding a log entry indicating deletion of the recorded message prior to storage within a subscriber message store, based on detecting that the prescribed variable specifies a detected difference between the first type and a detected type; claim 9,28,43 – terminating includes halting operations for transmission of a message, recorded during execution of the instance, into a subscriber message store).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to enable the method and system of Gibson to delete a recorded message and add a log entry indicating deletion prior to storage in a subscriber message store as shown by Ito. This would prevent wasting of memory capacity for the storage of voice messages.

- In regards to Claims 8, 27, and 42,

Gibson discloses connection handling in communication networks that covers all limitations of the parent claims.

Referring to Fig. 3, Gibson shows fax detection facility 305 operates to detect if the call is a fax call. If fax tones are not detected on the incoming call, thereby indicating that the incoming call is a voice call, further voice call processing may proceed. Conversely, if fax tones are detected on the incoming call, thereby indicating that the incoming call is a fax call, further fax call processing may proceed (Col. 4, lines 59-64).

In Fig. 4a-b, Gibson shows that a voice message is downloaded and transmitted to the misdialing terminal regardless of whether the call is determined to be a fax call or a voice call. Therefore, Gibson does not explicitly show selectively terminating the instance prior to completing the sequence of messaging operations.

However, as shown above, Gibson discloses that the call is monitored by fax detection facility 305 in order to detect whether the call is a fax or voice call (Col. 4, lines 59-64). That detection result is then fed to message selector 310 (claim 8,27,42 – first type is a voice message; claim 8,27,42 – setting the prescribed variable to not perform the sequence of operations based on detecting that the incoming message is a fax).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Gibson to enable selective termination of the instance prior to completing the sequence of messaging operations for a voice call. Because the fax detection facility of Gibson is capable of identifying the call as a non-voice call prior

to the downloading and transmission of a voice message, terminating the voice call operations prior to the voice message downloading and transmission would eliminate unnecessary call processing and enable the system to operate more efficiently.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 1/18/2006 regarding claims 1-3, 5-22, 24-37, and 39-49 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- In the Remarks on pg. 12-13 of the Amendment, Applicant contends that the Examiner has disregarded the explicit claim limitations of independent claims 1, 11, 16, 20, 30, 35, and 45. Specifically, Applicant contends that the Examiner has not shown how Gibson discloses "terminating the instance prior to completion of executing the prescribed sequence of messaging operations" based on detecting a prescribed variable (a reject message).
- The Examiner respectfully disagrees. On pg. 5 of the Office Action filed 10/18/2005, the Examiner specifically addresses the contested claim limitations by citing the operation of fax detection facility 305 and message selector 310 of Fig. 3 and column 4, lines 59-64. The Examiner interprets the "prescribed variable" or "reject message" to be the detection of the received call as a voice or fax call in Gibson, where the instance is terminated for the type of call not detected.

- In the Remarks on pg. 13 of the Amendment, Applicant contends that the Examiner mischaracterizes the teachings of Gibson by stating that Gibson “advises the message selector 310 to continue with processing of the appropriate call type, moving the call information to either Fax download 330 or Voice Download 355” in addition to the citation that “Gibson shows that the incoming call constitutes an initiation of messaging for both voice and fax call types.”
- The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The two citations of Gibson contested by the Applicant are independent of each other. Referring to Fig. 3, the “initiation of messaging for both voice and fax call types” refers to 300, where the call is forwarded from a forwarding switch. At this point, the call type has not been determined and messaging is initiated as if the call is a voice or a fax call. “Advising the message selector 310” is performed after this messaging initiation, by Fax detection facility 305. Furthermore, the Examiner concedes that Gibson teaches transmission of a voice message for both fax and voice calls and that both voice and fax messages are downloaded in response to a received fax. However, as shown in Figs. 4b, Gibson discloses that the sequence of operations for subsequent call processing is predicated on the result of the Fax detection facility 305, such that the standard “instance” for a fax call either continues or terminates. In this way, Gibson shows that the “instance” of a fax call application process is “terminated” in response to the detection result.

- In the Remarks on pg. 13-14 of the Amendment, Applicant contends that the Examiner disregards the independent claim limitation of the terminating including "removing the first data from the first data structure." Furthermore, on pg. 15-17 of the Amendment, Applicant contends that the modification of Gibson is without foundation and contrary to the explicit teachings of Gibson.
- The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The explicit teachings of Gibson cited by the Applicant pertain to functionality that goes beyond the scope of Applicant's disclosure. Gibson shows the storage/retention of misdialed CLIs and transmission of a voice message regardless of detected call type are performed by Gibson to facilitate further processing of misdialed calls that do not have any relevance to the basic operations of call-type detection and processing discussed in Applicant's Specification. Modifying Gibson for implementation of just these basic operations alone would result in the same structure and operation as the claimed invention, as shown above.

Conclusion

Examiner Note: The status of the previous Office Action filed 10/18/2005 was not properly indicated as Non-Final or Final. Due to inconsistencies in the record, the 10/18/2005 Action will be regarded as Non-Final and the present Action is therefore made Final.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory B. Sefcheck whose telephone number is 571-272-3098. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on 571-272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2662

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GBS
1-30-2006



JOHN PEZZLO
PRIMARY EXAMINER